



Missouri
Department of
Natural Resources

***Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Water Protection Program
303d Stakeholder Meeting, April 11, 2006***

Attendees: Ed, Galbraith, Phil Schroeder, Rich Burdge, Randy Sarver, Sarah McMichael and John Ford - Missouri DNR, Larry Shepard – US Environmental Protection Agency, Karen Bataille – Missouri Dept. of Conservation, Caitlyn Peel - St. Louis Home Builders Assn., Robert Brundage – Newman, Comley and Ruth, Aimee Davenport – Lathrop and Gage, Roger Walker - Regform By phone: Ted Salveter – City Utilities of Springfield, Buffey Santel – MSD, Dorris Bender – City of Independence.

The meeting began at 10:00 and included a discussion of data eligibility issues, predominantly data age and how to deal with older data. Problems with the conference call did not allow the three phone participants access to the meeting until about 11:00. After lunch, the department proposed wording for the Listing Methodology Document (LMD) to address databases where all data was more than seven years of age.

The discussion then moved to Table One. The attendees discussed the Level One biological monitoring portion of this table. DNR has proposed some clarifying language in the April 12 revision. Some attendees did not agree with the department's revision of the portion of the table relating to Protection of Aquatic Life for toxic chemicals and for toxicity testing. DNR proposes to change the chronic criteria full attainment definition from allowing a 10 percent exceedence rate to one that allows no more than one exceedence in a three-year period. DNR noted that the length of time it took for the aquatic biological community to fully recover from a toxic event (typically 6-12 months) meant that the 10 percent rule may not be protective of aquatic life.

The final portion of the LMD discussed was Table B-1 in Appendix B. This table provides specifics on statistical tests. There attendees discussed how to assign the burden of proof and whether or not it was fair to choose a number greater than the sample mean, such as an upper confidence limit. It was noted that for the Public Drinking Water Source Water Supply use that the true risk to human health of a criteria violation is relatively small since treated waters are monitored regularly and problems are dealt with quickly. Based on these comments, DNR has made changes to the significance levels for statistical tests in this portion of the table.

The department reminded stakeholders that the 60-day public comment period on the LMD ends May 5 and asked for all additional comments on the current draft of the LMD by that date.